UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,136	11/14/2003	Damian Mark Riddoch	PP-02-1	9552

7590   01/24/2006

DAMIAN RIDDOCH
4881 WEST CAVE PEAK DRIVE
RIVERTON, UT 84065

EXAMINER
PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/713,136	RIDDOCH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 November 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>14 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Nov 14, 2003</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: To the application filed on

November 14, 2003.

2.   Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 19 and 21 are independent claims.

Priority

3.   Acknowledgement is made to applicant's claim for priority to U.S. Provisional

Application Serial No.60/426322, filed on November 14, 2002.

Information Disclosure Statement

4.   The IDS submitted on November 14, 2003 does not list any references therefore

the examiner has not considered the IDS.

Drawings

5.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to label the

drawing as **figure 2** described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential

for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing.

MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any

amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the

immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The

figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If

a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the

replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered

and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date

of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or

"New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the

examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in

the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Vulpe (U.S. Pub 2004/0205540, filed Dec 13, 2001) in view of Cornelia (U.S. 6,065,026,

filed Jun 13, 1997, with provisional date Jan 9, 1997).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Vulpe discloses a system for managing

reference numerals comprising: An element database for receiving and storing a

plurality of element names (paragraph 15, wherein Vulpe teaches two different

databases that represent document components. The intersection rule database

and the intersection instance database, just as the element and reference

databases. The intersection rule defines an intersection rule record. Each record

corresponds to a document intersection space. The document intersection space

links the context between the document and the rule database. The element and

reference databases represent specific content from the document that is stored

in different locations or databases. Vulpe describes two different databases but

they represent various content from the same document); A reference database

for receiving and storing a plurality reference numerals, wherein selective

reference numerals in the reference database correspond to selective element

names in the element database (paragraph 15, wherein the reference and

element databases relate a particular reference numeral to an element name.

Vulpe shows that the intersection rule database and the intersection instance

database correspond to each other since they both associate using the

document intersection space(s). Therefore the rule database corresponds to

selective document intersection spaces in the instance database. The term

correspond is vague, correspond could mean the linking or two different

databases corresponding content by referencing the same document. One can

construe that the two databases are directly linked, however the corresponding

leaves the claim open for either interpretation); A manager system in

communication with the element database, the reference database, and at least

one document file, the manager system providing for user designated insertion of

element names and reference numerals into the document file, wherein changes

to an element name in the element database or changes to a reference numeral

in the reference database, correspondingly change the element name or

reference numeral in the document file (paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44, wherein

Vulpe also teaches a document management system that communicates with the

document intersection database which is made up of a rule database and a

instance database. The document manager updates the records within the

intersection database and then notifies the document(s) of the updates. The

document manager system provides for user designated insertion of content or

the editing of the document by providing a user interface. Therefore with the

manager system any changes within the instance database(s) are updated in the

document. In addition Vulpe shows that it is desirable to maintain the currency of

a document that is changed various times thru the use of a document

management system). Although Vulpe teaches the user designated insertion of

elements he fails to teach the insertion of fields in the document as described in

the specification. Cornelia teaches the inserting of fields in a document file that

represent components and then allowing the user either accept or reject the

updating of those fields. Cornelia also shows a database of marks identifying

each of the components within the document. Therefore each field represents a

component that is stored in a database (column 1, lines 40-67 & column 2, lines

1-38). Vulpe and Cornelia are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of document management and authoring systems. At the time

of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

too have included user designated fields for the insertion of component data. The

motivation for doing so would have been to provide an interface for allowing a

user to make changes or access components in a document file. Therefore it

would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cornelia with Vulpe for the

benefits of providing an interface to access document components.

Regarding Dependent claim 2, Although Vulpe teaches a manager system

Vulpe fails to explicitly teach a manager system with a menu that is accessible

through a word processing program (Abstract). However Cornelia teaches

wherein the manager system is one of a window, pull down menu, and toolbar

accessible at least through a word processing program (Abstract & column 1,

lines 40-67 & column 2, lines 1-38). Vulpe and Cornelia are analogous art

because they are from the same field of endeavor of document management and

authoring systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art too have included user designated fields for the

insertion of component data. The motivation for doing so would have been to

provide an interface for allowing a user to make changes or access components

in a document file. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the

teachings of Cornelia with Vulpe for the benefits of providing an interface to

access document components.

Regarding Dependent claim 3, Vulpe teaches a numbering system for automatically creating reference numerals within the reference database, wherein the reference numerals are created based, at least, upon user selected parameters of starting value and interval value (paragraph 48).

Regarding Dependent claim 4, Vulpe discloses wherein the reference numerals are re-definable in the numeral database based upon the sequential placement of the reference numeral in the document file (paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44).

Regarding Dependent claim 5, Vulpe discloses wherein the reference numerals are re-definable in the numeral database such that the reference numerals are in assenting order within the document file (paragraphs 63 & 64).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, Vulpe discloses wherein the manager system is operatively related to at least one hotkey operable within a document file operating program, wherein an element name and a corresponding reference numeral may be inserted into the document file upon operation of the hotkey (paragraphs 48-50).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, Vulpe discloses wherein operation of the hotkey in association with inputting a selective reference numeral inserts the element name that corresponds to the selective reference numeral (paragraphs 48-50).

Regarding Dependent claim 8, Vulpe discloses wherein operation of the hotkey in association with inputting portions the selective element name inserts the selective element name and the corresponding reference numeral (paragraphs 14, 15, 44 and 48-50).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, Vulpe discloses wherein the hotkey allows for selective insertion of a singular or plural of an element name (paragraphs 51-52).

Regarding Dependent claim 10, Vulpe discloses wherein the hotkey allows for selective insertion of a capitalized or lowercase form of an element name (paragraphs 53-55).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, Vulpe fails to teach a field located in the document file. Cornelia teaches wherein the element name and the reference numeral are maintained within a field within the document file (column 1, lines 40-67 & column 2, lines 1-38). Vulpe and Cornelia are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of document management and authoring systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art too have included user designated fields for the insertion of component data. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an interface for allowing a user to make changes or access components

in a document file. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Cornelia with Vulpe for the benefits of providing an interface to access document components.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, Vulpe discloses wherein the system manager allows element names to be inserted into document file wherein the corresponding reference numeral are omitted (paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44).

Regarding Dependent claim 13, Vulpe discloses where in the element database includes a list of plurals for the corresponding element names (paragraphs 43-48).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, Vulpe discloses wherein the element names and reference numerals are insertable into a drawing file, wherein changes to an element name in the element database or changes to a reference numeral in the reference database, correspondingly change the element name or reference numeral in the drawing file (paragraphs 3, 14, 15, 44 and 54-56).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, Vulpe discloses wherein the element names are selectively removable from the drawing file by the manager system (paragraphs 54-56).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, Vulpe discloses a system for associating

messages with the reference numerals and element names within the drawing

file for providing instructions relating to placement of the reference numerals and

element names within the drawing file (paragraph 51).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, Vulpe discloses wherein the element database

and the reference database are part of a library of element databases and

reference databases (paragraphs 14, 15 and 44).

Regarding Dependent claim 18, Vulpe discloses a means for inserting at least

one of the element names and reference numerals into the document file

(paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44).

8.   Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cornelia (U.S. 6,065,026, filed Jun 13, 1997, with provisional date Jan 9, 1997) in view

of Vulpe (U.S. Pub 2004/0205540, filed Dec 13, 2001).

Regarding Independent claim 19, Cornelia discloses a method in a computer

system for managing reference numerals, the method comprising: Inserting fields

into a text file, wherein the fields are made of element names from an element

database and reference numerals from a reference database, wherein selective

element names are associated with selective reference numerals (column 1,

lines 40-67 & column 2, lines 1-38, wherein Cornelia teaches the inserting of

fields in a document file that represent components and then allowing the user

either accept or reject the updating of those fields. Cornelia also shows a

database of marks identifying each of the components within the document.

Therefore each field represents a component that is stored in a database. The

numerals and element names represent components. A database is an

organized body of information therefore each component relates to a different

database); Inserting the fields into a drawing file (column 1, lines 40-67 & column

2, lines 1-38, wherein fields are inserted into a document file); Revising at least

one of the element names and reference numerals within the element database

and reference database respectfully, such that changes to the element names in

the element database and changes to the reference numerals in the reference

database change the fields inserted in the text file and the drawing file (column 7,

lines 15-60, wherein a revision function is provided that allows the user to access

the document from the library or database and then make the appropriate

updates to the documents, after the revisions are made and updated on the

database then the system closes the old revision and opens the new one in the

word processor). Cornelia teaches the use of an electronic document authoring

system that allows the user to change certain components and keep that

document updated on the system. Each component of a document is

represented has a mark in the database, therefore changes to individual

components are maintained by the database. In addition Cornelia indicates that

document assembly systems are not universally used, and current software does

not provide an optimal solution to the problem of multiple users generating, updating, and maintaining a number of different, but overlapping documents. Cornelia however doesn't provide a relation between the components that are stored in a database. Vulpe teaches the association between content in the different databases by referencing the document intersection space (paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44). Cornelia and Vulpe are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of document management and authoring systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art too maintain the correspondence between data items in a database. The motivation for doing so would have been maintain the currency of the document and all related documents that are associated with that document by maintaining the document intersection space. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Vulpe with Cornelia for the benefits of maintaining a current version of the document by associating components in a database.

Regarding Dependent claim 20, Cornelia teaches wherein the at least one of the element names and reference numerals is revisable thought one of a window, pull down menu, and toolbar accessible within a program by which the text file is created (abstract).

Regarding Independent claim 21, Cornelia teaches a method in a computer

system for identifying errors in a document having element names and

associated reference numerals, the method comprising:

a) Identifying a reference numeral within a text document (column 1, lines 40-67

& column 2, lines 1-38, wherein a component within a document is identified); b)

Providing for selection of an element name associated with the reference

numeral form the text document (column 1, lines 40-67 & column 2, lines 1-38,

wherein the authoring system provides for the selection of a component in the

document thru a GUI); c) Storing the element name and the associated reference

numeral in an element name and reference numeral database, such that the

reference numeral and element name are associated (column 1, lines 40-67 &

column 2, lines 1-38, wherein the components associated with the document are

stored within a database or library); d) Identifying subsequent occurrences of the

reference numeral, wherein the subsequent occurrence of the reference numeral

and the associated element name are compared with the element name and

reference numeral database (column 1, lines 40-67 & column 2, lines 1-38 &

column 7, lines 15-60, wherein the GUI provides the user an option of updating

the components, once they are changed and stored, an updated version of the

document with its revised components is displayed to the user. In addition all

components within the document that contain the same content are updated

throughout the database and then shown to the user); e) Indicating the presence

of an inconsistency between the reference numeral and element name in the

database and the subsequent occurrence of the reference numeral and the element names in the text document (column 16, lines 50-67 & column 17, lines 1-25, wherein the authoring system maintains the consistency of the document therefore it is inherent that the system would indicate the presence of an inconsistency between components in the library); f) Repeating steps a) through e) for other reference numerals and element names until an determined number of reference numerals are identified (column 16, lines 50-67 & column 17, lines 1-25, wherein the repeating steps are inherent since it maintains the entire document it identifies all components to maintain consistency). Cornelia however doesn't provide a relation between the components that are stored in a database. Vulpe teaches the association between content in the different databases by referencing the document intersection space (paragraphs 3, 14, 15 and 44). Cornelia and Vulpe are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of document management and authoring systems. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art too maintain the correspondence between data items in a database. The motivation for doing so would have been maintain the currency of the document and all related documents that are associated with that document by maintaining the document intersection space. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Vulpe with Cornelia for the benefits of maintaining a current version of the document by associating components in a database.

Regarding Dependent claim 22, Cornelia teaches a means for selecting an

element name to associate with an identified reference numeral (column 16, lines

50-67 & column 17, lines 1-25).

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or

figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the

references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference

is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would

have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See,

MPEP 2123]]

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Kintzley et al (U.S. Pub 2004/0088305) discloses "Reference Manager"

- Zollinger et al. (U.S. 6, 321, 236) discloses "Distributing Database

  Differences Corresponding To Database Change Events Made To A

  Database Table Located On A Server Computer"

- Shea et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0208459) discloses "Collaborative Context

  Information Management System"

- Sadiq et al. (U.S. 6,029,177) discloses "Method And System For Maintaining The Integrity Of A Database Providing Persistent Storage For Objects"

- Budka et al. (U.S. Pub 2003/0033270) discloses "Automated System For Managing Drawing Numbers"

- Sugiyama (U.S. Pub 2002/0083084) discloses "Database System, Its Control Method, And Information Processing Apparatus"

- Hirasawa (U.S. Pub 2003/0004988) discloses "Drawing Data Management System, Method And Program"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

January 20, 2006   CESAR PAULA

                                                         PRIMARY EXAMINER